ID: 88076777

Box 15
Folder 4
Item 15-44.01

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WORKSHOP:

Moving to Action in Making Community-Based Land Use Decisions

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

in cooperation with
The Center for the Rocky Mountain West
University of Montana, Missoula, Montana

June 1997

PREFACE

This report conveys issues and lessons learned from a two-day workshop on collaborative planning that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) held on April 23-24, 1997, in cooperation with the Center for the Rocky Mountain West in Missoula, Montana. We chose an intense dialog format with a small group of experts in promoting community-based approaches to resolving resource use issues in the West. Two Forest Service employees joined the dialog to share ideas and coordinate with BLM on their agency's collaborative stewardship initiative.

The workshop benefited greatly from the leadership of Daniel Kemmis, Director of the Center for the Rocky Mountain West at the University of Montana. A former state legislator and mayor of Missoula, Dan is known for promoting community-based approaches to sustainable economies and ecosystems in the context of rural communities. He is the author of two best selling books on this subject, *Community and the Politics of Place* and *The Good City and the Good Life*.

We want to thank all the participants who contributed freely of their experience and expertise to this workshop. The flow of ideas and lessons never let up. Unlike many two day workshops, the energy level never dropped. Special appreciation for this goes to the workshop facilitator, Rosalie Cates, who helped craft the agenda and dialog strategy and, then, guided two full days of intense, productive dialog. A significant part of the credit also goes to the workshop coordinator, Tom Youngblood-Peterson, who ensured smooth running of arrangements and pulled together the notes and framework for this report.

David Williams, Group Manager
Planning, Assessment, and Community Support
Bureau of Land Management

and

Peggy Harwood, Workshop Organizer
Planning, Assessment, and Community Support
Bureau of Land Management

May 1997

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WORKSHOP -- SUMMARY

Missoula, Montana
April 23-24, 1997

LESSONS:

- **Collaborative relationships over time build trust and a capacity to work together.** Collaboration has a lot in common with *Jeffersonian Democracy*: a belief that an informed and involved citizenry will make better choices and decisions.

- **Collaborative efforts work best when community led.** Even though federal land managers may initiate collaboration, they must know when to *let go*, to participate but remain open and willing to share power and responsibility with local communities and institutions.

- **Communities organize at different scales and must include national and local interests.** Collaborative planning represents a shift of power from the agency to the stakeholders, not a shift of power from the agency to only local communities.

- **The entire community must agree on protocols for monitoring what people care about.** Monitoring results of management actions is key. Collaborative approaches to achieving a common vision will only work if undertaken as a shared responsibility.

- **Success hinges on collecting and sharing a common base of science and information.** New information technology has become less costly and more widely used by all stakeholders. This situation lends itself to swapping data and compiling information from multiple sources.

- **Launch collaborative planning only when ready for prime time.** Community maturity is important. It's much easier to participate in a collaborative community effort when there is a willingness to work together to develop a common vision.

- **Recognize and avoid as many land mines and barriers as possible.** It is a mistake to think that a new era has dawned everywhere. There are some places where collaboration would not work just yet. Deep institutional and legal barriers may exist to collaboration.

- **Leadership is important. Learn to take risks. Adopt new roles and new attitudes.** Focus on building all kinds of relationships with both formal and informal networks of community opinion leaders. *Federal land management agencies cannot be good stewards by standing behind federal boundaries.*

Workshop Objectives:

1. Understand the context for and approach to collaboration.
2. Define community: what kind of community member does BLM want or need to be?
3. Understand role and expectations of public land managers.
4. Identify tools to facilitate collaborative decision making.

The Land and its People -- Historical Context

Land management is unique in that it moves people in the direction of collaboration when they pay attention to the land and the landscape. The great prophet of the West, John Wesley Powell, challenged his generation to inhabit the landscape in the West on its own terms, and to pay attention to the way the water flows. If they did this, Powell predicted, settlers would find the landscape more cooperative than if forced to live within straight boundaries in an unnatural relationship to the land. Today, land management faces critical challenges dealing with consequences of these straight-line ownership and jurisdictional patterns -- for the most part put in place without regard to the landscape.

Even with these artificial boundaries, something very powerful is emerging in the West. People are developing a sense of community that transcends old institutional and community structures as they become more aware of their connection to the landscape and to the ecosystems they love. These old structures remain shells within which something more organic has started incubating.

People generally express a desire to do good by nature, to do better. People don't say: "we want to ruin the watershed." Farmers, ranchers, and recreationists all feel a connection to the land, to a place. Although not the same as rural settings, people in urban areas also understand what it means to have a sense of place and develop strong attachments to their cities and neighborhoods.

In spite of these sentiments or, maybe because of them, never underestimate human will power and tenacity. People will try and often succeed in living where they want to. Natural systems may influence human development but these no longer absolutely dictate where and how people live on the land. Most costly natural disasters occur when people, and public policy, ignore the lessons engraved in the landscape by forest fires, floods, landslides, volcanoes, or earthquakes.

Public policy dramatically impacts land use management from flood control projects and large hydroelectric dams, to water rights, grazing fees, wildlife habitat, and even disaster relief legislation. Early in this century. public policy and feats of engineering created complex water ownerships and artificial watersheds diverting water to Los Angeles, for example, from natural watersheds hundreds of miles north and east. Modern transportation networks opened otherwise inhospitable areas for development. Las Vegas, a case in point, is rapidly growing and consuming a non-recharging ground water supply... setting up conflicts for space and water that will continue into the future.

Understanding the BLM Context for Collaboration

In two centuries, the Bureau of Land Management (originally the General Land Office) disposed 1.8 billion acres to private ownership and to state and other Federal agencies (parks, forests, refuges, military). BLM now has 10,000 employees in 200 field offices managing 270 million acres of public land, mostly in the West, and mostly in settings of intermingled private and public ownerships.

In 1976, the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) shifted the mission of BLM from primarily disposing public lands to one of retaining and managing these lands for multiple and sustainable uses. Since 1979, BLM completed over 111 land use plans that are compliant with FLPMA and with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

All these plans together form BLM's planning base. BLM adopted the strategy of keeping these land use plans up-to-date as needed rather than undertake periodic, major revisions of its planning base. New laws or court decisions or new information, such as new listings of endangered species and cumulative impacts or other scientific information learned from regional assessments and other sources, will drive plan amendments.

The planning process used rules for citizen involvement developed for NEPA. Typically BLM involved citizens at the initial scoping stage and then disappeared, sometimes for years, until ready to ask for comments on a thick draft plan. The process left many people thinking BLM ignored their comments. The challenge now before BLM is providing *meaningful involvement of citizens* in making land use decisions. What this means is that BLM must:

1. Set sideboards to assure that national interests are met.

2. Focus on a place-based approach to making decisions as recommended by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) in its January report on reinventing NEPA.

3. Become part of an open collaborative process inclusive of all the actors -- users and neighbors, visitors and friends, states, counties, other federal agencies -- everyone who should be part of this "community" process.

In making these changes, BLM has the problem that many people are concerned BLM is going to abdicate its responsibilities. BLM needs to develop materials, or have materials to point to, that alleviate that concern. BLM is striking a bargain with stakeholders. The agency is willing to share responsibility but expects things in return. BLM has not clearly articulated what the deal is. BLM will need its partners to become better informed, to help set a vision for future conditions, and to help with monitoring.

In considering what kind of community member BLM wants or needs to be, it helps to think of BLM as an institutional member of a community -- much like banks, schools, businesses, city and county governments, and even associations. BLM is not the only institutional member for which its income source (appropriations and, to a certain extent, fees), overall authority to make decisions, and its accountability stem from outside the local community. What makes BLM a key player in community-based land use management remains its assets:

- *Land* -- the critical tangible asset. Unlike the National Park Service, for example, BLM has authority to lease, sell, and trade lands under some conditions. BLM also implements national laws for multiple use of these lands.

- Other assets include *a highly skilled workforce* with technical expertise not commonly found in some communities; detailed land resource *information* that can be shared with counties and other partners; *money*; *equipment*; *recreation and other facilities*; *access to other federal agencies* through its own federal networks, and *formal power*.

- One intangible asset is *quality of life*. Communities surrounded by public lands attract people.

So... Is there an alternative to collaboration? Not really. The slow erosion of BLM budgets and staffing has become an ironic ally to collaboration. With only 10,000 employees, BLM needs help to deliver results.

Lessons and Key Messages

Collaborative relationships over time build trust and a capacity to work together.

Collaboration has a lot in common with *Jeffersonian Democracy*: a belief that an informed citizenry will make better choices and decisions. Collaboration will change you; it puts people and community in play.

BLM needs to encourage a certain level of *formality* as the community builds relationships and the capacity to work together. This helps avoid exclusive clubs of good old boy and girl networks. Informal relationships work best where they exist within or in parallel to some type of formal agreement or other framework.

Collaborative efforts work best when community led.

Even though federal land managers may initiate collaboration, they must know when to *let go*, to participate but remain open and willing to share responsibility with local communities and institutions.

Like banks and other institutional community members, BLM can lend credibility to many collaborative efforts where its mission and assets coincide with community interests.

Communities organize at different scales and must include national and local interests

Collaborative planning represents a shift of power from the agency to the stakeholders, not a shift of power to only local communities.

It's tempting to use the term, *communities*, in a very narrow way. Communities organize at different scales and, for BLM's purposes in collaborative planning, must include national and local interests. BLM, as a federal land management agency, must broaden its use to include the *communities of interest*, as well as *communities of place*.

The challenge facing BLM is getting *communities of interest* and *communities of place* talking to one another about the issues and challenges bringing people together. Communities remain dynamic, changing as the issues change. There is a critical need to recognize these different types and scales of communities and learn how to keep members informed and involved.

BLM will have to live with some ambiguity. On one hand, BLM must pay more attention to place-based communities and become more responsive to them. On the other hand, the Nation's laws, judicial system, and BLM's national organization require BLM to deal with national interests -- with all citizens.

It seems logical for people who live in a place to have a higher order role in collaborative efforts. However, place-based communities concerned with public land management issues could also include national interests and should remain inclusive... not exclusive. Communities must develop the capacity to deal with outside interests.

Self-selection or inviting/allowing a community to define itself can help keep the process open to all those interested. However, reliance on only these methods might clash with the national interest to ensure civil rights and diversity. The Nation has a strong history and interest in the civil rights movement and equality for cultural, social rights, women, people of color and other diversity. BLM must remain more proactive than self-selection implies.

The entire community must agree on protocols for monitoring what people care about.

Monitoring results of management actions and success towards achieving a common vision is key. Collaborative approaches to making land use decisions will only work in the long run if undertaken as a shared responsibility.

Community knowledge and energy is powerful. Tapping this resource gives people ownership of the process and gives the agency a much richer set of information.

Success hinges on collecting and sharing a common base of science and information.

The old paradigm or assumption no longer holds -- that BLM or another federal land management agency would have the best, if not the only, scientific information for understanding the landscape and making decisions.

First start with asking members of the community to identify on a map what they know and what concerns them before professional presentations on technical issues. Sit people down with blank base maps (showing streams, roads, basic boundaries but not much else) and with other GIS maps available. *The technical knowledge of regular people often surprises the experts!*

New information technology has become less costly and more widely used by individuals, interest groups, state and local governments, and tribal governments. This situation lends itself to swapping data and compiling information from multiple sources.

In Wyoming, county governments and libraries use the World Wide Web and Internet. Even though more widely available, small groups and local communities might still have a tough time finding resources to effectively use information technology. Agencies could help with technical support, especially for geographic information.

Geographic information system (GIS) technology is crucial to displaying relationships among landscape elements, socio-economic elements, the management situation, and future options so people can see how things fit together.

Because this is electronic technology, GIS graphics on the Internet can help dispersed members of a community of interest participate in public land management planning efforts like the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument.

Science and information technology should not be used for the wrong end. The process must provide information that can be questioned; not just used to convince people of one solution or interpretation or value. Information has to serve the collaborative process.

Launch collaborative planning only when ready for prime time.

Community maturity is important. It's much easier to participate in a collaborative effort when there is a willingness to work together to develop a common vision.

The public has become very cynical. Right now, collaboration may have more enemies than friends. The question is one of power. In collaborative efforts, where will the power reside for making land use decisions? BLM must take care to stay out of difficult polarized situations that are not ready or *ripe* for collaboration.

Collaborative efforts on public lands seem to work best today in smaller geographic areas, on the local level, without waking up the giants in D.C.

Collaboration is not really that much fun; it's not a form of recreation! Collaboration requires a sense of timing, skill, and determination -- and may still fail.

Recognize and avoid as many land mines and barriers as possible.

Collaborative efforts can fail if:

- The process is not structured to build trust with national interest groups.
- Some way is not found to include both national and local interests.
- Cumulative collaborations become too exhausting for willing individuals who find that collaboration begets collaboration...
- Decided resistance is encountered to the collaborative process.
- Adequate time, skills, and resources are not provided. (Will supervisors think this is a good use of time?)
- The legal and bureaucratic structure in place is perpendicular to/at odds with collaboration.
- Groups or relationships become exclusive and appear to violate the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).
- Language barriers (linguistic, technical, professional...) exist to discourage participation by affected parties
- Differences in fiscal processes among partners obstruct sharing resources.

Keep in mind that collaboration changes -- and can threaten -- existing relationships between members of a community. It is a mistake to think that a new era has dawned everywhere. There are some places in the West where collaboration may not work just yet. BLM must keep in place a system, as backup, for those places where you can't work collaboratively.

There may be deep institutional and legal barriers to collaboration.

Leadership is important. Learn to take risks. Adopt new roles and new attitudes.

A new field manager, in the first weeks on the job, should focus on building all kinds of relationships:

- Identify and visit the formal power brokers and community leaders.
- Get to know the informal networks of community opinion leaders; visit the *ministers and bartenders*. The informal power structure may be the most important thing to understand when becoming a member of the community.
- Get to know your staff and your organization... its strengths and weaknesses. Decide who is going to get involved in new collaborative efforts from your staff. Identify those who will resist collaboration inside your organization (up and down).
- Walk the ground; spend time outside. Listen, listen, listen... Find out who likes and dislikes each other. Learn the social history, the environmental history, the personal history of community members and staff.

In general.... BLM must figure out how to give all its field managers and partners the ability and confidence to take risks. Collaborative efforts involving mixed ownerships and multiple jurisdictions require persistence and hard work to balance local and national interests and simultaneously comply with applicable laws and regulations.

BLM has several leadership challenges:

- Communication both vertically and horizontally
- Staff mix not conducive to collaboration
- Administrative systems that don't work to support collaboration

To help improve capacity for collaboration, BLM should:

- Simplify administrative support in ways needed for collaboration, e.g., agreements, informal participation, sharing resources, etc.
- Begin thinking about what funding is needed to support these efforts; and what decision making best supports collaboration.
- Develop or link to interagency and intergovernmental efforts (e.g., President's Council on Sustainable Development); maybe develop interagency working groups to further collaboration at different levels

BLM managers should understand FACA but not let it intimidate action. Look for opportunities to join or support existing collaborative efforts in the community.

It's important to recognize that some things that need changing in the agency remain outside the individual manager's or even the agency's control. For example: Will BLM select and reward its managers for a collaborative style? What will BLM do with managers that don't know or use this process? Will Congress support this move?

BLM would have a different role in high and low capacity communities. In low capacity communities, BLM has more of a facilitation/convening role and can help obtain rural development grant money for building community capacity.

Federal land management agencies cannot be good stewards by standing behind federal boundaries. Successful collaborative efforts in the FS and BLM evolved outside the formal system. Creative, secure managers push the norm, push the procedures, but do not break the law.

TOOLS FOR COLLABORATION: An Outline

BLM has distinct challenges in designing tools to help managers with collaboration. Field managers will need to recognize when an opportunity is ripe for successful collaboration. Managers will need to understand that collaboration is an incremental process and not to expect too much, too soon.

Once a community of people has come together that wants to learn together,

- How can BLM help **develop a common, shared base of information**?
- How would BLM play some role in a community process to **develop a common vision** for the land that incorporates BLM values without being a BLM process?
- Once a common vision exists, what tools would help **implement and institutionalize** it ... whether from BLM or other sources?

Will BLM managers retain the option of using the new collaborative process or the old process that emphasizes avoiding litigation and confrontation? Is this change explicit or implicit? If this new system is running parallel to the old structure, then we need to think seriously about policy shifts, including internal policy shifts. The existing legal framework does not prohibit collaboration but is also not conducive to it.

The Aspen Institute developed for EPA a conceptual framework for a community-based alternative to setting water quality standards as an explicit parallel framework, not a replacement to the old way of doing things. That way, if the collaborative approach didn't work for a particular situation, then EPA could choose the original track.

Tool 1. INFORMATION

For collaborative efforts to work, BLM must share the information it has. BLM is strong with biological and physical science-related information but weak with socio-economic information. BLM can help a county obtain socio-economic data even though sometimes perceived within BLM as less important... a softer, *inferior* kind of information.

BLM must learn to make use of existing sources of information -- inside and outside the agency -- to create and analyze scenarios. A State information clearinghouse or individual state agency can be a good source of information. Challenges include:

- Obtaining and transferring local knowledge into the process.
- Linking to information above and below the scale you're working with.
- Synchronizing information collected at different times and scales. Bringing into the picture the resources and capabilities of state universities.
- Publicizing results. Organize a science symposium around a landscape or planning area -- like the one on the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in May -- to learn about archaeological studies and other information on public lands that we don't know about.

Remember: BLM can share, delegate, help, facilitate, and SOMETIMES do information collection and management.

Example of a policy question: How can BLM provide computers to a county to help build capacity for collaboration?

Tool 2. COMMUNITY VISION AND INVOLVEMENT

Separate tools are needed for (1) BLM field managers and for (2) partners and participants in collaborative efforts involving BLM.

ACTIONS:

1. Generate a short list of workbooks and other written materials that would be useful to BLM managers and other participants in collaborative efforts
2. Sponsor training opportunities for BLM managers and partners. Inventory and assess what's out there already, such as Building Common Ground, and Community-based Partnerships & Ecosystems for a Healthy Environment. Ensure that advanced training opportunities are available.

3. Provide targeted technical support
   -- Compile list/directory of facilitators
   -- Identify regional programs that help build capacity for collaboration (e.g., university programs, state rural development councils, consulting organizations.

TOPICS to be covered:

- Special techniques: use media resources, public affairs, solicitors
- Models for collaborative processes: identifying constraints and expectations, developing ground rules, clear outcomes
- Use of different public involvement tools (focus groups, public media, radio, surveys etc.) When and how to use a third party facilitation or mediation
- Working with formal and informal networks (institutional mapping, cumulative collaboration - linking efforts & adding value to previous efforts)
- How to assess readiness and timing (when to hold, when to fold)
- How to help develop a community vision
- Interfacing with local planning processes: developing common goals, strategies for land exchanges, recreation and green space, etc.

Some resources need to be compiled on a regional basis, easily accessible to field managers in specific states.

Tool 3. IMPLEMENTATION

The conceptual shift is this: does BLM set the table or does BLM sit at the table? The steps are the same, but attitude and role are very different. BLM should not be setting the table but should bring resources to the table. Mission-driven organizations should not control outcomes. There is a trust issue.

What is the charge to the area managers? Go forth and collaborate? Go forth and help? How do agency managers get ready, and identify efforts to get involved with? Collaboration must become a preferred style (new way) for implementing the rules (old way).

REQUIREMENTS FOR COLLABORATION:

- Opportunity must have readiness, incentives
- Agency manager must be ready to "think outside the box" i.e.. you can't just reference your plan; must be ready to change it
- The agency must have readiness and able to provide capabilities
- Certainty that all appropriate interests are represented
- Capacity to enter into agreements and new arrangements
- Financial capacity and flexibility
- Monitoring capacity; all party monitoring (democratic data collection)
- Evaluation process in place (e.g., continuous improvement model from industry): build in evaluation benchmarks along the way; three parameters: political effectiveness, biophysical indicators (does it mean anything to fish), and economic (improvement to local community)

BLM and other federal agencies are legally required to participate in open meetings with outside groups. Companies are used to closed meetings of a Board of Directors to bring some closure and certainty. Managers must realize that you cannot please every single actor. Some collaborative groups are advisory and some decisional.

To characterize all collaborative efforts as win-win is very dangerous, because, honestly, not everyone will win. BLM must recognize that national movements have already begun forming to counter consensus processes and the perception of community-based efforts giving decision making power over public lands to local elites. McClosky, Chairman of the Sierra Club and others are challenging collaboration as dis-empowering its urban-based membership.

National and local interests are important. Be sure to include both at beginning. Develop a common vision and pay attention to monitoring.

Set realistic expectations for collaborative efforts. Respect sideboards within existing body of law. National environmental groups get nervous when local groups say they want to be absolved from process requirements of NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, etc. This whole path may not work without addressing every piece of land legislation.

Think about how to build a willingness into the agency to find another way to say *yes*, legally, when BLM comes up against a regulatory or other process barrier. What BLM can do is change its internal guidance in manuals and handbooks. Regulations are politically driven. If you can't sell it politically, you can't change the regulations.

Planning in BLM is sometimes thought of as -- *Byzantine planning regulations imposed upon a medieval organization!*

APPENDIX A

Bridging from the Forest Service Collaborative Stewardship Workshop
Missoula, Montana
April 21-22, 1997

The Forest Service workshop in Missoula is part of an agency wide strategy developed by Cooperative Forestry to help the Forest Service (FS) work better with rural America. Sustainability has emerged as a key issue in moving the agency to community- based management of the landscape. The Forest Service vision includes providing for healthy ecosystems, vital communities, and an effective organization. Within this context, collaboration has become an important underlying theme.

It's important that both agencies are discussing collaborative approaches. The Forest Service leadership embraced collaborative stewardship as a logical way to do ecosystem management. The agency also realizes that it cannot mandate or dictate the process. Given that there are more external participants than internal, how does the FS define collaboration to win confidence and trust with all it must do business with?

Lessons from the FS workshop suggest that collaboration is like rediscovering grassroots democracy. There are no rules for undertaking collaborative efforts and probably shouldn't be for flexibility. As the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest Supervisor, Debbie Austin, noted at the FS workshop: *Collaboration is like building the boat while going downstream!*

Other lessons suggest there are lots of good material and experience available. Don't reinvent the wheel. Use case studies. Adapt or interpret the lessons of others for agency needs.

BLM and FS agreed at the meeting to work together to avoid developing a BLM approach to collaboration, a FS way, a NRCS way, and so on...

APPENDIX B

Transition to collaborative approaches to making land use decisions

Defining communities - Dan Kemmis

Long-term, equitable relationships formed around very real places help define *communities* for land management purposes. In a Missoula example, discussions between a county commissioner and the Lolo National Forest Supervisor about planning a new trail system eventually expanded to include the city and the State -- becoming a trails consortium. Some lessons learned from this experience included:

- The staff level developed a strong informal network when they became excited about how their respective agencies could contribute to an integrated trails system. This spilled over to the heads of agencies and helped overcome barriers from different kinds of players with different decision structures.

- The collaborative process evolved and remained dynamic throughout. At first, the FS led the effort but over time the city moved into that role, as it was physically at the center of the trail system.

- The players respected each other as equal community members in a long-term relationship; agreed who was in the best position to do what and allowed the leadership role to change as needed.

What is most important is that collaborative relationships build a *capacity* to work together over time and build *trust*.

Southwest Wyoming - Bill Daniels

BLM manages about 40% of the surface and 70% of the mineral estate in Wyoming. The challenge for BLM was how to apply ecosystem management statewide and make land use decisions based on natural systems. In Wyoming, BLM contracted with the Botany and Zoology Departments at the University of Wyoming to map landtype associations using the system developed by Bob Bailey (National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units, ECOMAP, USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C. , Robert G. Bailey, 10/29/93).

BLM's objective was to build a seamless map of the whole state and eventually to work with other states where the natural systems overlap to extend this coverage. This effort has the support of the Governor, state agencies, the FS, and the National Park Service (NPS) -- a partnership in the broadest sense.

Mapping these landforms allowed BLM and its partners to collaboratively develop information about land resources and, also, make prescriptions for managing areas with uniform characteristics that anyone can follow...an individual land owner, FS, BLM, a business etc. ... if they want to. Each landtype association covers about 1000 to 10,000 acres. The people who live on the land, the community, would recognize these units ... and, in fact, helped name them: foothills, rolling plains, dissected breaks, etc.

Science is important. The partnership of information is important. These partnerships developed effective prescriptions only after collecting and analyzing ground data. What's happening with the grass, with the wildlife, with the soils? What about activities like oil and gas development? How many wells can go into an area and still sustain air quality standards and the health of the natural system?

It's important to get the right interests at the table. A partnership includes the community of interest on the ground -- but the interest doesn't make the decision, just individual land owners and public land managers for the land areas they manage.

How do we move from the old process to something new? Most federal agencies are not paying enough attention to collaborative approaches to gathering information.

Wyoming has 75 coordinated resource management (CRM) programs, the highest in any state, which are especially useful in mixed ownerships. These are successful, in part, because of strong State support. CRM's achieve common goals for enhancing the quality of natural systems... with diverse memberships including, local ranchers, BLM, FS, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Trout Unlimited, Audubon Society, University of Wyoming, the Elk Foundation, the Nature Conservancy etc. Training everyone in the CRM partnership together was important.

Southwestern Colorado- Michael Preston

The Office of Community Services at Fort Lewis College (OCS/FLC) spent the last eighteen years working with local communities to build the capacity to deal with the institutions that are critical to their future. OCS got involved in public land issues in early 1992 when asked by the County Commissioners to organize and coordinate the Montezuma County Federal Lands Program to insure meaningful local involvement in public land planning, policy and decision making. The following insights into the collaborative process emerged from a restoration initiative known as the Ponderosa Pine Partnership and the community-based "study group" approach to the San Juan Forest Plan Revision:

1. *The importance of Leadership*: Montezuma County took the initiative by approaching land management agencies in a collaborative mode. Managers on the San Juan National Forest and BLM Resource Area showed leadership in responding with an openness an eventual willingness to share power with local communities and institutions.

2. *The importance of neutral process support*: OCS/FLC had long-standing linkages with local communities and institutional leaders in facilitating collaborative projects and problem solving. Process facilitation can come from any of the partners or from other sources.

3. *A tangible problem to solve*: On one of the first county sponsored field trips (1992) a District Ranger identified the need to thin and restore ecological health to Ponderosa Pine Forests. The timber association president proposed financing the effort with the value of commercial products. The Ponderosa Pine Partnership was born.

4. *Seed money for collaboration*: The Ponderosa Pine Partnership (1993) applied for, and received, Rural Community Assistance (RCA) funding to get started.

5. *The importance of science*: The local environmental community indicated that their support hinged on good science and the re-establishment of natural fire cycles in the Ponderosa Pine ecosystem. Montezuma County hired an ecologist that environmentalists trusted to establish range of natural variability and fire cycles. Ecological studies were coupled with a pine beetle and catastrophic fire risk assessment conducted for Regional Forest staff (1993-95). The ecologist and a San Juan National Forest forester worked together to prescribe and lay out a "restoration sale (1995)."

6. *The importance of occasions to broaden participation*: The Forest Association (Spring, 1995) sponsored a workshop on forest health attended by a balance of researchers, land managers, loggers and environmentalists to review science and discuss future goals and roles for participants. The participants selected a 500 acre pilot, 100 acres of which fell on private ranch land under guidance of the Colorado State Forest Service.

7. *Seeing is believing*: Many people, from all walks of life, visited the pilot sites and had the opportunity to see, feel, and discuss the result of the restoration effort.

8. *Monitoring and evaluation:* Formal ecological monitoring is in place to evaluate thinning controlled burns. Equally rigorous production monitoring studies (adding Colorado State University as a partner) are in process to address the economic development and pricing challenges posed by harvesting small diameter trees. Opportunities to review ecological and production findings occurred at a conference on "Growing Sustainable Forest Products Industries (1995) and on a technology transfer field trip, "Forest Restoration Through Partnership" next week (May, 1997). These workshops had wide geographic participation.

9. *Link between on-the-ground restoration and the planning process:* Lessons and relationships from the Federal Lands Program and the Pine Partnership resulted in the development of a community-based approach to the San Juan Forest Plan Revision (1994-95). Community Study groups have functioned on each of the three ranger districts for the past 18 months (1996-97). In the course of pursuing a wide range of issues related to the relationship between the community and public land, the study groups visited the pine demonstration and its science. The Pine Project has enriched the Study Group process, and the Plan Revision is an opportunity to establish, and build support for, a long term strategy for Ponderosa Pine Restoration into the Forest Plan.

10. *The need for dissemination*: Other communities and agencies want to know about the Pine Project and the community-based forest planning effort. New initiatives are cropping up locally (e.g. a project to do mixed confer restoration on the other end of the Forest involving another county). An umbrella known as the "Community-Public Land Partnership" was established in 1994 (with RCA funding assistance) to address new opportunities (like the forest plan revision) tackle additional restoration challenges (e.g. mixed confer and range) and to disseminate to other localities and through training programs such as the collaborative ecosystem partnership training put on by the BLM National Training Center.

11. *Integrated planning - turning fragmentation into an ongoing "value-added" strategy*: Since 1992 we have integrated economic development, transportation, county land use, and forest planning by developing and refining common data bases and cross boundary issues. Example: The Ponderosa Pine restoration effort is addressed in the Southwest Colorado regional economic development plan and the Montezuma County Comprehensive Land Use Plan (including joint fuel and fire risk reduction across local/federal boundaries and cross boundary wildlife issues).

12. *Many institutional barriers remain.* Achieving sustainable community/ecological outcomes require removing existing bureaucratic obstacles and economic challenges. All parties must actively work together to bust these barriers and keep the promise of collaboration alive and growing (e.g. the effort to develop a stewardship contracting mechanism, and allow for restoration pilot projects).

13. *Mutual goals and shared successes are the building blocks.* Trust is the mortar that holds them together.

APPENDIX C

BLM COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WORKSHOP
PARTICIPANTS LIST
April 23 - 24, 1997

Daniel Kemmis, Director
Center for the Rocky Mountain West
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812-1205
406-243-7700
fax: 406-549-4977
email: kemmis@crmw.org

Sarah B. Van de Wetering, Managing Editor
Chronicle of Community
Northern Lights Institute
P.O. Box 8291, Missoula, MT 59807
406-721-7415
Res: 406-543-3771
email: SBVMontana@aol.com

Donald Snow, Executive Director
Northern Lights Institute
P.O. Box 8291
Missoula, MT 59807
406-721-7415
fax: 406-721-7416
Res: 406-549-8526
email: dsnow59803@aol.com

Brad Ack, Director
Conservation Field Programs
The Grand Canyon Trust
3100 N. Fort Valley Rd. #8
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
520-774-7488
fax: 520-774-7570
email: ack@gct.flagstaff.az.us

Luther Propst, Executive Director
The Sonoran Institute
7290 E. Broadway Blvd, Suite M
Tucson, AZ 85710
520-290-0828
fax: 520-290-0969
email:soninst@azstarnet.com

Ray Rasker, Senior Economist
The Wilderness Society
Northern Rockies Regional Office
(now with the Sonoran Institute)

Michael Preston, Associate Director
Office of Community Services
Fort Lewis College, Montezuma County Courthouse
109 W. Main, Cortez, CO 81321
970-565-8317
fax: 970-565-3420
email: pinez@fone.net

Maia Enzer, Program Director
Forest Policy Center
American Forests
910 17th Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
202-955-4500
fax: 202-955-4588
email: menzer@amfor.org

Dick Gardner, Executive Director
Idaho Rural Partnership
317 Main Street
Boise ID 83735
208-334-6113
fax: 208-334-6118
email:dgardner@labor.state.id.us

Larry Finfer, Program Analyst
Office of Policy Analysis,
Department of the Interior
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-7786
email: Lawrence_Finfer@ios.doi.gov

Kit Muller, Special Assistant to the Deputy Director

Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (101) 5660 MIB
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-5922
email: kmuller@wo.blm.gov

David Williams, Group Manager
Planning, Assessment, & Community Support
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (WO 210) 1075LS
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-452-7793
fax: 202-452-5112
email: d55willi@wo.blm.gov

Peggy Harwood, Policy Analyst
Planning, Assessment, & Community Support
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (WO 210) 1075LS
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-452-0362
fax: 202-452-5112
email: pharwood@wo.blm.gov

Horace Traylor, Rural Community Development Specialist
Planning, Assessment, & Community Support
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (WO 210) 302LS
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-452-5123
fax: 202-452-5112
email: htraylor@wo.blm.gov

Gary McVicker, Special Assistant to the State Director
BLM Colorado State Office
2850 Youngfield St. (CO-910)
Lakewood, CO 80215
303-239-3744
fax: 303-239-3933
email: gmcvicker@co.blm.gov

Bill G. Daniels, Senior Resource Advisor
BLM Wyoming State Office
P.O. Box 1828
Cheyenne, WY 82001
307-775-6102
fax: 307-775-6082
email: bdaniels@wy.blm.gov

Mary Gaylord, Resource Management Programs
Special Projects and Initiatives Team
BLM WO-107D, Building 41, Suite 166
P.O. Box 25047, Denver Federal Center,
Lakewood, CO 80225-0047
303-236-6313
fax: 303-236-4410
email: m30gaylo@nc1155wp.sc.blm.gov

Ruth McWilliams, Assistant Director
Cooperative Forestry
USDA-Forest Service
201 14th St., NW (4SE)
Washington, DC 20250
202-205-1373
fax: 202-205-1271
email:/s=R.McWilliams/ou1=w01c@mhs-fswa.attmail.com

Bob Breazeale, Deputy Director
Ecosystem Management Coordination
USDA-Forest Service
201 14th St., NW (5S)
Washington, DC 20250
202-205-1278
fax: 202-205-1271
email:/s=B.Breazeale/ou1=w01c@mhs-fswa.attmail.com

Tom Youngblood-Peterson, Workshop Coordinator
& Recorder
Center for the Rocky Mountain West
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812-1205
406-243-7700 (or, 406-543-9551)
email:ty-p@wildrockies.org

Rosalie Sheehy Cates, Workshop Facilitator
Montana Western Region
Economic Development Group (WEDGo)
127 N. Higgins
Missoula, MT 59802
406-543-3550
email:roswedgo.ism.net

BLM COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WORKSHOP
Center for the Rocky Mountain West, Missoula MT
April 23-24, 1997

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Participants will gain understanding of the BLM context and unique view of collaborative approaches to making land use decisions in landscapes with mixed ownerships and multiple jurisdictions
- Define the "community" that would meet BLM's collaboration goals and answer: "What kind of community member does BLM want or need to be?"
- Gain understanding of the role and expectations for public land managers when starting or joining collaborative opportunities.
- Design a tool kit and produce a course of action that moves the BLM to make the transition to active collaboration in making decisions.

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 23

8:00 AM	Coffee and rolls - Informal Introductions
9:00	Introduction - What's unique about land management?
10:00	Context for BLM moving to collaborative approaches to making decisions - David Williams
10:30	BREAK
10:45	Bridging from April 21-22 USDA Forest Service Collaboration meeting
11:15	Defining "communities" - Dan Kemmis
11:45	LUNCH
1:15	What kind of community member does BLM want or need to be?
2:00 PM	Report out on community member work
2:30	BREAK
3:00	The role of the BLM manager in the new collaborative era - expectations,skills How learn from the knowledge and experience of others in the community?
5:00	ADJOURN

AGENDA - CONTINUED

Thursday, April 23

9:00 AM Transition to collaborative approaches to making decisions
- Presentations: Michael Preston, BLM Field Manager

9:45 Response: Guiding Principles

10:45 BREAK

11:00 Staging an agency transition

12:00 LUNCH

1:30 Tool Kit Design

1. Tools for promoting effective community-based groups
   - Identifying opportunities
   - Creating incentives and rewarding collaboration
   - Training people - agency and other community members
   - Creating community relationships
2. Technical Tools
   - Becoming better informed about socio-economic and ecological trends in the landscape and community; developing shared vision
   - Implementing a shared vision for landscape use and economic development (e.g., zoning, transferrable development credits, ... ?)
   - Collaborative approaches to monitoring and adapting management actions in response to new information and demands

3:00 BREAK

3:15 Reporting out/clarifying ideas

4:00 Parting thoughts and evaluation

5:00 ADJOURN

BLM COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WORKSHOP

Center for the Rocky Mountain West, Missoula, Montana
April 23 - 24, 1997

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Daniel Kemmis, Director
Center for the Rocky Mountain West
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812-1205
406-243-7700
fax: 406-549-4977
email: kemmis@crmw.org

Sarah B. Van de Wetering, Managing Editor
Chronicle of Community
Northern Lights Institute
P.O. Box 8291, Missoula, MT 59807
406-721-7415
Res: 406-543-3771
email: SBVMontana@aol.com

Donald Snow, Executive Director
Northern Lights Institute
P.O. Box 8291
Missoula, MT 59807
406-721-7415
fax: 406-721-7416
Res: 406-549-8526
email: dsnow59803@aol.com

Brad Ack, Director
Conservation Field Programs
The Grand Canyon Trust
3100 N. Fort Valley Rd. #8
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
520-774-7488
fax: 520-774-7570
email: ack@gct.flagstaff.az.us

Luther Propst, Executive Director
The Sonoran Institute
7290 E. Broadway Blvd, Suite M
Tucson, AZ 85710
520-290-0828
fax: 520-290-0969
email:soninst@azstarnet.com

Ray Rasker, Senior Economist
The Wilderness Society
Northern Rockies Regional Office
105 W. Main St., Suite E
Bozeman, MT 59715
406-587-7331
email: rrasker@igc.apc.org

Michael Preston, Associate Director
Office of Community Services
Fort Lewis College, Montezuma County Courthouse
109 W. Main, Cortez, CO 81321
970-565-8317
fax: 970-565-3420
email: pinez@fone.net

Maia Enzer, Program Director
Forest Policy Center
American Forests
1516 P Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
202-667-3300
fax: 202-667-7751
email: menzer@amfor.org

Dick Gardner, Executive Director
Idaho Rural Development Council
Statehouse - Room 112
PO Box 83720
Boise ID 83720-2438
208-334-3131
fax: 208-334-2438
email:dgardner@dfm.state.id.us

Larry Finfer, Program Analyst
Office of Policy Analysis,
Department of the Interior
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-7786
email: Lawrence_Finfer@ios.doi.gov

Kit Muller, Special Assistant to the Deputy Director
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (101) 5660 MIB
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-5922
email: kmuller@wo.blm.gov

David Williams, Group Manager
Planning, Assessment, & Community Support
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (WO 210) 1075LS
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-452-7793
fax: 202-452-5112
email: d55willi@wo.blm.gov

Peggy Harwood, Policy Analyst
Planning, Assessment, & Community Support
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (WO 210) 1075LS
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-452-0362
fax: 202-452-5112
email: pharwood@wo.blm.gov

Horace Traylor, Rural Community Development Specialist
Planning, Assessment, & Community Support
Bureau of Land Management
DOI/BLM (WO 210) 302LS
1849 C St., NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-452-5123
fax: 202-452-5112
email: htraylor@wo.blm.gov

Gary McVicker, Special Assistant to the State Director
BLM Colorado State Office
2850 Youngfield St. (CO-910)
Lakewood, CO 80215
303-239-3744
fax: 303-239-3933
email: gmcvicker@co.blm.gov

Bill G. Daniels, Senior Resource Advisor
BLM Wyoming State Office
P.O. Box 1828
Cheyenne, WY 82001
307-775-6102
fax: 307-775-6082
email: bdaniels@wy.blm.gov

Ruth McWilliams, Assistant Director
Cooperative Forestry
USDA-Forest Service
201 14th St., NW (4SE)
Washington, DC 20250
202-205-1373
fax: 202-205-1271
email:/s=R.McWilliams/ou1=w01c@mhs-fswa.attmail.com

Bob Breazeale, Assistant Director
Cooperative Forestry
USDA-Forest Service
201 14th St., NW (4SE)
Washington, DC 20250
202-205-1372
fax: 202-205-1271
email:/s=B.Breazeale/ou1=w01c@mhs-fswa.attmail.com